

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/039,677	01/04/2002	Stephen Brian Falder	16644/09003CIP	9699	
27530 75	90 07/12/2006		EXAMINER		
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL		
1320 MAIN STREET, 17TH FLOOR COLUMBIA, SC 29201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1616		
			DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006	DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/039,677	FALDER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alton N. Pryor	1616
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified aboye, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Ag This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,46,-49,52,53,59,61,62,70,71,78,82-4a) Of the above claim(s) 49,53,88-91,95-98,10 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,46-48,52,61,62,70,71,78,82-85,92,9 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are∕subject to restriction and/or	0 <u>0,111,112 and 116-119</u> is/are wi	thdrawn from consideration.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	n □	(DTO 440)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)	
	·	

Application/Control Number: 10/039,677 Page 2

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

I. Rejection of claims 1,46-48,52,61,62,70,71,78,82-85,92,99,105-110,113-115,120-134 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Jackson and Dorothy will be maintained in light of amendment filed 4/18/06 for reason on record and reason as follows.

- 1) Applicant argues, claimed invention taken as a whole cannot be considered to be obvious without some reason given in the prior art as to why one of ordinary skill would have been prompted to combine Jackson and Dorothy. Examiner argues that Jackson and Dorothy teach antimicrobial compositions for disinfecting surfaces; therefore, since references disclose the same utility, it is proper to combine them.
- Applicant argues, references cited by Examiner cannot be combined because the combination does not provide any evidence that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a sufficient basis for the required expectation of success. Examiner argues, since both references teach anti-microbial compositions for disinfecting surfaces, an artisan would expect for there combination to do the same - this is success.
- 3) Applicant argues, Dorothy teaches that a strong acid is required in the composition to promote adhesion of the composition to surfaces such as glass; a person skilled in the art would not have contemplated adding the polydimethylsiloxane of Dorothy to Jackson, which does not contain a strong acid. Examiner argues, the claims employ comprising language

Application/Control Number: 10/039,677 Page 3

Art Unit: 1616

which allows for the inclusion of additional ingredients such as strong acids.

- Applicant argues, because the example in Dorothy requires the presence of three surfactants in addition to polydimethylsiloxane, an artisan would have had no expectation that a useful composition containing polydimethylsiloxane could be produced not containing three surfactants. Examiner argues, the claims employ comprising language which allows for the inclusion of additional ingredients such as the three surfactants.
- Applicant argues, compositions of the invention not only kill microorganisms that are present on a surface to which they are applied but also
 have a residual effect in that they substantially reduce / control formation
 of microbial colonies on or at the surface to which they have been applied;
 in other words, instant compositions have a lasting effect. Examiner
 argues, applicant is arguing subject matter which is not a claim limitation.
 In addition, since the combination of references result in the instant
 composition, it is expected that the final composition would exhibit the
 same utility, i.e., a lasting effect once applied to a surface.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

Art Unit: 1616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alton Pryor

Primary Examiner

AU 1616